

Appl. No. 09/849,513  
Amdt. dated March 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2004

Docket No. 70325-040017

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2004, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 14, 19. Claims 4 and 7 have been amended to correct minor informalities. Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner points out that it is not clear how and what document is received by the recipient party. Claim 23 has been amended to clarify that the business transaction document is received by the recipient party in a manually configured communication format. No new matter has been added with this amendment. In view of this amendment, Applicants request that the rejection to claim 23 be withdrawn.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1-22 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Information in eFax.com (eFax) in view of Facsimile Support/400 Version 3 (IBM).

#### Claim 1

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that an electronic transaction document is sent to a first recipient in a non-communication format and to a second recipient in a computer communication format.

The eFax reference or any modification of eFax is directed toward transmitting documents in the same communication format to all parties. On Page 24 of the eFax reference, for example, eFax teaches "you can automatically distribute the faxes you receive to five different email addresses.". eFax does not teach sending the same document to multiple parties in different communication formats.

Appl. No. 09/849,513  
Amtd. dated March 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2004

Docket No. 70325-040017

The Examiner cites IBM to state that IBM "teaches creating of a first computer a business transaction document that is compatible with a business management program." The combination with IBM does not cure the deficiency of eFax explained above. Thus, eFax in view of IBM does not teach sending a business transaction document to one party in a computer communication format, and to second party in a non-computer communication format.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn based on the inapplicability of eFax. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 2-10 should also be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 14 and 19

Independent claims 11, 14, and 19 all have been amended to clarify that an electronic transaction document is sent to a first recipient in a non-communication format and to a second recipient in a computer communication format. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of independent claims 11, 14, and 19 should also be withdrawn.

Further, claims 12-13, 15-18 and 20-21 depend respectively from independent claims 11, 14 and 19. Therefore, Applicants also submit that the rejections of these claims also be withdrawn.


In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance, and such early action is respectfully requested. Should matters remain that the Examiner believes could be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (310) 586-6512.

Appl. No. 09/849,513  
Amdt. dated March 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2004

Docket No. 70325-040017

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s), or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number 50-2638, Deposit Account Name Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number 70325-040017 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Pablo Tapia  
Reg. No. 52,275

Date: March 22, 2005

Customer Number 33717  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E  
Santa Monica, CA 90404  
Phone: (310) 586-6512  
Fax: (310) 586-0512  
e-mail: tapiap@gtlaw.com